



09-05-02

2856
#3 Response
Ubrown
9/10/02

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

David M. Tucker et al.

Serial No.: 09/892,314

Filed: 06/26/2001

Title: Subsea Vechicle Assisted
Pipeline Commissioning Method

Art Unit 2856

Examiner:
Garber, Charles D.Attorney Docket
VCS001

Response to Office Action

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In response to the Office Action of June 5, 2002, please consider the remarks made below.

Remarks

Claims 1-13 at present appear in this application. The allowance of claims 10 and 11 is noted with appreciation.

In response to the Restriction requirement between invention I (claims 1-6 and 13) and invention II (claims 7-12), Applicants elect invention II with traverse. The traverse is to the Examiner's statement: "In the instant case the hydostatic testing of group II interferes with the function of dewatering occurring in group I and are therefore not capable of use together." If what is meant is that both methods cannot be used simultaneously or at the same time the conclusion is true; however, the two methods are certainly capable of use in sequence, first, hydostatic testing followed by dewatering. It

TECHNICAL CENTER 2800

RECEIVED
SEP -9 2002